

CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.

130 EAST TWENTY-SECOND ST., NEW YORK, N. Y.

VOL. XX, No. 1

BULLETIN

JANUARY, 1941

Juvenile Court and Children's Services

THERE have been some unhappy experiences in which the Court has been felt to exert undue pressure on agencies to accept children for placement or other services which the agency did not feel equipped to give. Since this problem is of widespread concern both to the social agency and to the juvenile court, the Editor of the BULLETIN asked two judges of juvenile courts, the head of a social agency, and the head of a school of social work to discuss this problem briefly. We will be glad to receive further comments and discussion on this subject.

Donald E. Long

Judge, Circuit Court of Oregon, Fourth Judicial District

Few policies can be more destructive to a social agency than the consistent acceptance of cases which it is not equipped to handle properly. It cannot be denied that juvenile courts frequently overlook the agency point of view in making referrals on the theory that even a foster home or an institutional placement, entered into by the agency with much misgiving, may be preferable to commitment to a state correctional school or to returning a child to a destructive environmental situation. No one should, therefore, be surprised if a large percentage of these referrals eventuate in failure. It is time, perhaps, that the courts and the child-caring agencies come together for a serious consideration of this problem.

The point of view of the juvenile court, which I have expressed elsewhere, may be summarized here briefly. The true function of the juvenile court in the community should be:

1. The investigation of reported cases of delinquency and dependency.
2. The obtaining of social diagnosis and formulation of a treatment plan which will be a basis of referral to some treatment agency apart from the court.
3. Formal adjudication of all matters pertaining to delinquency and dependency where informal social treatment by the agency requires legal disposition as a basis or a supplement to its case work plan.
4. Adjudication of all children's cases involving permanent commitment to institutions or agencies.
5. Reinvestigation and rehearing of cases in which a change of plan may be recommended by the original agency to which the case was referred.

6. Handling on a supervisory basis of all juvenile offenders for whom no adequate treatment program can be secured apart from the court.

The point of view of the social agencies caring for children is, naturally, for me somewhat more difficult to formulate since the direct responsibility of the court falls short of this area. However, I believe that, indirectly, the juvenile officials of a community must see that adequate consideration is given, in the treatment field, to the needs of all boys and girls known to the court. If, in a given community, a situation exists which includes duplication of resources for the care of dependent children and inadequate resources for the treatment of behavior problems, the answer suggests itself. The agencies meeting together should find it possible, with the court acting in an advisory capacity, to redefine their own scope and objectives so as to meet needs where they exist. It would seem to me that any large city should be provided with both a foster home agency and an institution specifically organized and equipped to handle behavior problems in children who must be given a controlled environmental situation.

An agency placed in the position by reason of pressure, internal or external, of accepting cases for which its equipment is not adequate and which may force it in the direction of goals not foreseen or accepted by its board of directors should not be regarded by the court as a treatment resource. Rather, the court should ask the agency to define its functions in terms of sufficient clarity that it may be assigned its proper place in the resource picture.

If each agency in a community has thought through its own program to the extent of knowing definitely what it hopes to accomplish and what it can accomplish with the means available, there should not be too much difficulty in focusing community attention

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
INSTITUTE OF JUVENILE SOCIAL ADMINISTRATION
LIBRARY
30 E. FERRY AVENUE
DETROIT, MICHIGAN

on whatever gaps may exist in the treatment field. I believe that any organization of social agencies would agree that what resources exist in its community must be so differentiated and administered as to provide the maximum variety of treatment facilities.

An encouraging factor in this situation is the willingness of child-caring agencies in general to recognize the arbitrary quality of the distinction between the dependent and the delinquent child. In point of fact, many dependent children present behavior problems of varying degrees of severity, and most delinquent children could be classified as being also dependent. Probably the differentiation of function which an agency might have to make would be on a quantitative rather than a qualitative basis since no one can predict with certainty that individual children will not at some time in their career exhibit symptoms of behavior difficulty.

The task of the agency is, therefore, to decide up to what point in the handling of these problems it can administer treatment. An agency organized for the purpose of giving foster home care can, in a sense, accommodate a much wider range in this respect than can a children's institution, since the problem of behavior is so drastically influenced by the presence or absence of other children.

However successful experimentation with foster home care for delinquent children may have been, there would seem clearly to exist a definite need for institutional care as well. The more limited range of cases properly treatable in the institutional type of environment is in itself a favorable factor in the achievement of a successful outcome.

Case histories of children handled in juvenile courts usually reveal that both foster care and institutional treatment are frequently used for the same child. We cannot, of course, say that this combination of treatment technique has always been dictated by the child's individual needs. Obviously, faulty integration of case work resources and inadequate diagnosis may have been at times responsible. Nevertheless, I do not doubt that a great number of cases have existed and do exist wherein a continuing diagnosis would demonstrate the need for both types of care during various stages in a child's development.

It should be recognized that this problem in its entirety is affected by an apparent conflict of trends in our general psychological study of behavior. On one hand, we are becoming increasingly aware of the great importance of regarding every child as an individual. The more we seek to understand him, the more necessary we find it to discard stereotypes and

preconceptions. We find that he exists primarily not in terms of other case histories we have read or written, but in terms of himself: his own background, developmental history, intellectual endowment, emotional needs, etc.

On the other hand, since we are committed to the scientific study of behavior, we are forced into a struggle for achievement of objective standards whereby we may analyze, classify and understand children. I am not prepared to explore this aspect of the question deeply, suffice it to say that a realization of its existence may help to prevent our thinking on the subject from assuming overly rigid patterns. We are still in the experimental stage of the understanding and treatment of behavior problems.

Frank T. Flynn

Head of Department of Social Work, University of Notre Dame

ANY comment on this problem must be predicated partly on the statement of fact, and partly on assumptions. Perhaps a beginning may be made by redefining, or at least restating, the problem.

Essentially there seem to be two issues: (1) The private children's home staff believes that the agency is handicapped by the presence of boys who are court cases, and in addition are of borderline mentality, or have violated probation, or are on the "waiting list" for the State School. (2) The court exerts pressure to insure the agency's taking these boys.

In the first place, the description of these boys tells us nothing. Many private children's homes seem to be doing good work with those who are of borderline mentality. Every day many boys violate probation, but very few of them have received the intelligent, skilled guidance they need. Countless boys have been committed to State Schools who should not have been sent there. However, the staff should know, and at least the term "seriously handicapped" should be taken as some indication of the true situation; consequently, one assumes that these particular boys do not belong in this particular institution, although one cannot be sure about it.

If these boys do not belong in the institution, the second issue becomes serious. The charge then is that the court exerts pressure to see that these boys are committed to an agency where they cannot be treated adequately. No right-minded judge would do this, so this court either is not right-minded or acts in ignorance, or he has no facility available which he believes is more adequate. We might as well assume that the courts are right-minded, and that they do not act in ignorance; and this leaves us in

a community which doesn't have adequate facilities for treatment of juvenile delinquents—in other words, a typical community.

In typical communities children's agencies are not geared into the program for the treatment of behavior disorders, the courts do not select treatment facilities based on the personality demands of the offender, and the community is niggardly with its appropriations for treatment of juvenile delinquency. Schools could do much, but as a rule they do very little other than to provide for the ministrations of a truant officer, and such persons are characteristically ineffective.

There are also many complex questions of relationships between and among agencies, and frequently the needs of children are overlooked in these conflict situations, and this is especially true of "problem" children. After all, we are able to make a very poor defense of our attempts to handle the problem of delinquency; by and large not very much effort is put forth, and as a rule essential services either are inadequate or of rather poor quality. If one were called upon to give a word of advice, perhaps it could be summed up as follows: Most communities need a re-appraisal of the adequacy and extent of their facilities for treatment of problem children, and a coordination of existing facilities in such a way that the child, not the agency, becomes the core of the treatment situation.

Nelle Lane Gardner

Executive Secretary, Children's Service Association, Milwaukee

For a number of years this agency has delegated to one member of the staff the responsibility for being our representative at the Juvenile Court. The worker is selected after a consultation with the Chief Probation Officer of the Court and must be acceptable to the court workers. Fortunately, our relationship with the Chief Probation Officer is of the type that we talk to him frankly and we are constantly reminding him that the Juvenile Court has a special function to perform in the community and that their function is not that of another child welfare agency, that we should supplement each other and if they perform their function they need never be threatened by changes which will curtail their work. There is, and must continue to be, the closest relationship between our agency and the Juvenile Court.

The agency is given a copy of the court calendar so that we know when cases are coming up which might be of special interest to this agency. It is the

general policy between the agencies that if the court wishes us to accept a case from them they will report it in time for us to make our own intake investigation in order to determine whether it is the kind of a case we feel we can and should accept. It is also the policy that the case is not to be put on the calendar until the agency has completed the investigation. Now, it is true that some of the Juvenile Court workers refer a case without giving us sufficient time to make the investigation. In rare instances they have given us only a day or two for the study. When this has been done, it has usually been due to the pressure of work on the court worker. If sufficient time is not allotted for the investigation, we insist that the case be postponed to a later date for hearing.

In the past we had considerable difficulty because the Juvenile Court workers wished us to accept cases that were either too difficult for us to handle in a foster home or were referrals of cases with very doubtful prognosis. In these instances it seems to me that the Juvenile Court understands our reasons for not accepting the cases but they haven't resources in the community and are desperate. I think I am safe in saying that the Juvenile Court is no more inclined to send us the difficult case than are other agencies in the community.

Our real problem is that there are no facilities in this state for the very difficult older child except foster home care and care in the industrial school. If we had a small institution equipped to handle the very difficult child, I think the problem in this community would be fairly well solved. In the public child-caring field there are the same limitations.

Digressing from the question a little, this agency at the present time is trying, through the presentation of cases, to arouse the interest of our Board and the community in providing more adequate facilities for the children with very difficult problems.

This agency could spend all of its time doing preventive work and we would prefer to give that kind of service but because the need is so great we do have to give too much time to the curative aspect of our work. (I use the word curative for need of a better word.) We have never been able to determine what proportion of our service could be given to the preventive aspect as the community's problem differs so from time to time. Our goal for the future is having the community see the value of referring children when the first symptomatic behavior appears so that we can truly do the preventive job. Our educational program is conducted along this line, but I presume it will be a long time before we can realize our goal.

I should like to make one further suggestion in regard to the Juvenile Court and children's agencies: a Juvenile Court be given a fairly good understanding of the intake policies of a children's agency, including an explanation as to why these policies have been set up. This will serve not only as a guide to the court in referring cases but will remove a good deal of feeling that arises at various times.

Trends in Public Child Welfare

From Report of the Department of Social Welfare, State of N. Y.

THE last four years have shown a continuation of the general trend away from institutions toward foster home care of children. The number of children in foster homes was 25,134 at the end of 1936, and 27,051 at the end of 1938.

A detailed analysis of the children in foster care at the end of 1938 shows that only one-fourth were under the direct care of public agencies, and the remainder were cared for by private agencies. The great majority of children in foster care, however, are supported wholly or in part from public funds. In 1938 over 85 percent were classified as public charges, or under public supervision, and the rest were provided for through private philanthropy.

Until 1936 the licensing of all boarding homes for children was a responsibility of the State Department of Health. As the number of children received in boarding care increased, there was evidence that more emphasis should be placed upon the social aspects of the licensing and certifying of homes accepting children for board from parents or guardians or from child-placing agencies. Accordingly, the Legislature in 1936 made an appropriation to carry out a law passed in 1934, which had placed upon the State Department responsibility for licensing boarding homes where children were placed by parents or guardians.

Through the Department's supervision of the work of child-placing agencies and by observation at the time of visits to certified boarding homes, it is evident that the standards of boarding homes in use have improved. Each application for a license or certificate is thoroughly studied by competent persons. Consequently, many children, particularly those now placed by parents or guardians, are spared the devastating experience of being placed in an entirely unsuitable home with persons who lack ability to give a child the care and training which will enable him to develop physically, emotionally, socially and spiritually to his greatest capacity.

Infant Care in Foster Homes

TO EVERY child-placing agency that sets itself upon the high road of venture to place all of the infants referred for care in foster homes rather than institutions, there comes the question of proving to our community that the things we believe are true. Recently the writer was challenged by a community leader who said that foster care for infants was a "passing fad" and we would soon swing back to nursery care for all babies. He stressed the importance of infant hygiene that can be obtained only when the nurse who bathes the baby wears a mask and rubber gloves. We must admit that photographs of infants under sun lamps, cared for by immaculate nurses, has a strong appeal in the mind of the average person.

Child-placing agencies—particularly those with an adoption program—are just as much concerned over the emotional and social development of babies as they are with the physical.

We have learned a great deal from our psychologist, who has tested babies in an institution and after removal and placement in a foster home. Our records show that the physical development of the baby is not always as great as one is led to expect. For a baby to gain healthy, solid flesh, he must exercise. This does not come as naturally to the baby isolated in his institutional crib as it does to a baby in a foster home, where an interested and loving audience applauds when the baby makes his first attempts at coordination.

We recently watched with interest the efforts of an eighteen-months-old boy who made a creditable effort in trying to bat a ball. His persistence indicated muscular development as well as ability to concentrate. The encouragement of a father and older brother acted as the chief stimulus. The role of the foster father in the development of the infant should never be minimized or overlooked.

The Children's Service Bureau has at present thirteen babies under the age of two in foster homes. This represents a very small percentage, as Allegheny County has not moved in the direction of foster care for infants as rapidly as some communities. Excerpts from observations made by the Pediatrician, who examines the child, the Psychologist, who administered the Gesell Tests for infant development, and the Social Worker, who supervised in the foster home, reveal findings which are convincing as well as challenging.

A boy of sixteen months was placed in a foster home from an institution where he had been placed

some weeks after birth. The Social Worker recorded, "When he first went to the foster home he was unable to drink from a cup, he seemed frightened; when anyone spoke to him, he began to cry."

From the psychological report, we saw a retarded child—particularly in speech and motor coordination. This was based on a test at seventeen months. A retest at two years showed poor cooperation, distractibility and negativism. He tired quickly; his speech showed slight improvement.

On the physical side of his development, we found frequent colds and subnormal temperature. His tonsils were enlarged. He fell easily, often injuring himself on sharp pieces of furniture. His first foster mother found his negativism, which took the form of temper tantrums and refusal to eat, too much to cope with. Removal to another foster home was difficult for him, and his symptomatic behavior became exaggerated. From the Social Worker's record, we find, "General behavior is destructive. He cannot play with toys, throws them and attempts to hurt people."

"Foster mother has tried to be kind and patient, but thinks this does no good." "He resists everyone and deliberately soils himself." We have no way of determining what this boy might have been like had he been in foster home care from the beginning, but we do know that after sixteen months in an institution we found a badly damaged child from the social point of view.

At twenty-four months, when this boy should normally be considered for adoption, we find serious problems that will require expert social and psychiatric treatment, together with continued foster home placement, to overcome.

A five-months-old baby was removed from an institution to a foster home. The Social Worker from Children's Service Bureau recorded her impression of him in the institution. "Peter is a very thin, white baby. He does not have hair and his eyes are rather nondescript." On this date of observation, he appeared to be "listless." He was tested at seven months. (After he had been in a foster home two months.) The psychologist recorded, "On the whole Peter is somewhat retarded in development. With a child of this age it is not safe nor fair to make a prognosis, especially with the history of an institution in his background. However, prospects are not bright. He should not be considered for adoption until later tests are made."

Peter was a great favorite in his foster home and the neighbors soon became interested in helping him develop. He learned to differentiate between mem-

bers of the foster family and neighbors, would study their faces intently, at first reserving a smile for the foster mother but gradually coming to the point where he smiled readily at members of a group. He enjoyed his swing on the porch, and after he had been in the foster home a month he began banging and making noises that caused him to laugh aloud with glee. A psychological retest at thirteen months is recorded. "Peter has made such a marked improvement since the last examination it seems safe to offer him for adoption. His poor motor coordination, so much in evidence at the first examination, has disappeared, and he is up to his age in language development." Physically Peter was of normal weight and development.

The infants placed in foster homes during the past year range in age from two weeks to one month. Their physical, social, and psychological development has been carefully studied.

At the end of his first year one of these babies was placed for adoption, as he had developed at such a steady rate, was such a friendly child socially, and was up to the psychological and physical norms for a child of his age. When he was four months old, the foster parents noticed that he attempted to imitate sounds; passing aeroplanes he watched with fascination. The songs of neighboring children caused him to gurgle with happiness. His gain in motor coordination was remarkable. At the age of eleven months he could handle himself adeptly and would attempt difficult feats without any show of fear. Walking and talking came spontaneously, with great pride on the part of the foster parents. His placement in an adoption home was made with ease and his adjustment to the new environment is satisfactory.

The Children's Service Bureau, while constantly examining and measuring its service to babies, has built up records showing child development in all of its stages. These records have shown us far beyond the trial and error stage that good foster home care is both economical and safe from the standpoint of the future of a baby and the contribution that baby will make to the community.

—(MRS.) CHRISTINA F. ADAMS
Supervisor, Children's Service Bureau, Pittsburgh

A Decade of Experience in Adoption, by Ora Pendleton, The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Philadelphia, November, 1940, traces the development of social concern with how to help and how to protect all those interested in the adoption procedure. It discusses how the social agencies can help parent and foster parent consider this step soberly.

BULLETIN

Published monthly (omitted in July and August) as the official organ of the Child Welfare League of America.

The Bulletin is in large measure a Forum for discussion in print of child welfare problems. Endorsement does not necessarily go with the printing of opinions expressed over a signature.

Annual subscription, \$1.00

Single copies, 10c.

Checks payable to Child Welfare League of America, Inc.

Defense Brings National Agencies Closer Together

PROBLEMS raised by mobilization for defense have lengthened the working days for many who are employed by national as well as local social agencies. It should be remembered that in 1917 some of these national agencies, the Child Welfare League among them, had not been born. Like many of the young men now wearing military uniforms, such national agencies find these warlike days entirely strange.

The National Social Work Council has proved of great value as a forum and as a bureau for clearance of problems pertaining to defense. For years the Child Welfare League of America has been a constituent member of this Council and finds here a ready channel through which it may coordinate its work with that of other national agencies.

A newer fellowship is the Social Case Work Council, in which may be found only those national agencies having local member agencies engaged in case work. This Council is loosely related to the National Social Work Council and in no sense duplicates it. Within the Social Case Work Council national agencies can study problems peculiar to case work and help one another meet these problems. Its organization was hastened by the present defense situation, but it is evident that these agencies have much aside from defense to bring them together. There has been a definite harmony in the cooperation already developed, a harmony due to common purposes in the practice of social case work.

Private social work, like that under governmental auspices, is still blinking its eyes at some of those tremendous needs of mobilization days which now confront us or which are imminent. Agencies dealing with transients and families in overcrowded communities already have had their loads greatly increased as in the case of local Travelers Aid societies. But it is clear that child care agencies will find a

somewhat delayed demand for increases in their services.

The Council of National Defense has recently issued an order with the approval of the President assigning to Mr. Paul V. McNutt, Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, the responsibility of coordinating health, medical, welfare, nutrition, recreation and other related fields of activity affecting the national defense. The first step in carrying out this responsibility is clearly one of analyzing the nature of the problems to be met and the resources available to meet them, and of formulating plans for a coordinated approach on the basis of common planning by all groups active in the field, including the private as well as public agencies. The National Social Work Council has, upon invitation from Mr. McNutt, sent representatives of national agencies to Washington to confer on such subjects. The Executive Director of the League has been one of those attending such a conference.

The National Social Work Council prepared and issued in December a pamphlet entitled, "Health and Welfare Services in the National Defense," which is going this month to all members of the Child Welfare League. This pamphlet was based upon material presented by constituent groups within the Council. To assist in this work the Russell Sage Foundation temporarily loaned the services of Mr. Russell H. Kurtz, editor of the Social Work Year Book. The separate and more detailed statement of the case work group, "Social Aspects of the National Defense Program," is being sent in mimeographed form. We are pleased that the League has had a share in the preparation of these statements and to be able to distribute them.

It is a purpose of the League's staff to represent, as far as possible, the interests and responsibilities of all who are engaged in the care and protection of children. To do this will absorb much time in 1941. But whatever it costs this effort and that important by-product, increased cooperation among national agencies, will bring lasting benefits.

—HOWARD W. HOPKIRK

Regional Conferences

New England Regional Conference will be held March 28 and 29 at Hotel Commander, Cambridge, Mass. Miss Lucy A. Turner is Chairman.

Midwestern Regional Conference will be held April 17 and 18 at the Hotel La Salle, Chicago, Illinois. Mr. M. K. Reckord is the Chairman.

Expanded Staff Permits Visits to League Members

Six additional field secretaries have been employed temporarily for part-time services to permit the Child Welfare League to renew and strengthen its relations with its 168 member agencies. This expanded staff is assured only for the first three months of 1941, during which time 50 members will be visited. If within this period there is sufficient increase in financial support, the plan for an expanded staff will be extended for an additional three months' period. It is the desire of the League's Board of Directors that all member agencies be visited in 1941.

The League proposes to quicken educational relationships which will permeate all work of League members and have some impact on all children's work in the United States and Canada. It is clear that there are more child welfare workers in these countries than ever before and that every strong center of children's work should become as effective as possible in improving and safeguarding all those services which the League's members provide. The essence of the proposed program is to draw from every region such experience and planning as could not possibly emanate from one national office in New York. The principal function of the field staff will be to stimulate locally such educational activity.

To these ends and to lay definite plans the temporary part-time staff joined the League's small regular staff for a conference in New York December 30 and 31. It was difficult to decide where the first visits should be made. Not every community can be among those to be served during the first three months. The qualifications of the staff warranted planning their work along both geographical and functional lines.

The Executive Director is proud to have such well-qualified workers for this initial expansion of the League's reorganized program. Their professional achievements are sufficiently known to permit the following brief references in introducing them to the readers of this BULLETIN.

MISS ETHEL BARGER, Superintendent, Milwaukee Orphans' Asylum, a popular teacher and surveyor, who will work especially with children's institutions.

MISS ABIGAIL BROWNELL, formerly Director, County Agency Department, Pennsylvania Children's Aid Society, and more recently responsible for a survey of the Division of Child Guardianship, State Department of Public Welfare of Massachusetts.

MISS MARGARET REEVES, now on the faculty at the University of Denver, formerly Director, Bureau of Child Welfare of New Mexico; author of "Training Schools for Girls," written while she was on the staff of the Russell Sage

Foundation; recently responsible for a survey of public child care in Minnesota.

MISS FLORENCE VAN SICKLER, Executive Secretary, Child Welfare Association, Atlanta, with previous experience as executive of the Family Welfare Society of Mobile and of the Children's Aid Society of St. Louis.

Committed only for occasional services and for less time than will be expected of those already named are:

MRS. LEONA STUART ARESON, Agency Consultant, Federation of Protestant Welfare Agencies, New York City, to which position she has devoted only part time since she and Mr. Areson moved from New York City to the State Industrial School for Boys, Industry, New York. Previously Mrs. Areson was Consultant and Institute Leader for the Department of Public Welfare of Ohio and Director of the Foster Home Department, The Children's Aid Society, New York City.

MISS ORA PENDLETON, Executive Secretary, Children's Bureau of Philadelphia, also experienced as a teacher at the Pennsylvania School of Social Work.

In addition to the visits they will make, some of this work may be undertaken by Mrs. Henrietta L. Gordon and Mr. Ernest H. Cole of the League's regular staff. The Executive Director also may make a few visits to members, but most of his time must be reserved for administrative duties in New York.

Progress of the Social Work Vocational Bureau

THE Social Work Vocational Bureau, at 122 East 22nd Street, New York City, is rapidly becoming established as a national placement service for social workers, according to a report of its Board of Directors. The Bureau already has an individual membership of about 800 social workers, most of whom are interested in placement service. It has an agency membership of 160, in the fields of family and child welfare, medical social service, child guidance, and related fields. A number of the schools of social work are also affiliated.

The Bureau is receiving requests to fill vacancies from agencies in various parts of the country—from Maine to California, from Michigan to Texas. The list of vacancies covers positions for executives, supervisors and teachers, as well as case workers. The Bureau reports that placement work is going steadily forward with agencies throughout the country.

Member agencies paying full assessments of dues to the Child Welfare League will thereby be entitled to membership in, and free service from, the Social Work Vocational Bureau.

THE BOARD MEMBER SPEAKS—

A Board Member Regional Conference

The attendance of board members at the Southwest Regional Conference in St. Louis in November was encouraging. The local agencies were well represented and there were board members from places as far away as Houston. Some came as participants in the program and rightly, for discussion helps layman and professional alike to point up his thinking. The board members at St. Louis were certainly responsive and frank in their discussion of the topics suggested. A little practice by some of our younger board members in leading such groups would increase the value of such institutes. The panel discussion on citizen participation in child welfare movements was decidedly spirited and particularly valuable to those interested in legislation because of the straight thinking and frankness of Senator George Rozier of the Missouri Legislature and of Edmund B. Shea of Milwaukee, a member of the Children's Code Commission which was successful in putting through child welfare legislation in Wisconsin.

Naturally, the more active, alert, and progressive board members are those who appear at conferences and not all of them. This interested lay group present is usually aware of the value of the trained social worker and vitally interested in the child who can be helped only by the most expert service. Conferences, however, are apt to be discouraging to the

board member as they are so often devoted to technical discussion or generalities. What we want to know and must ask are such questions as: Why should family ties with inadequate, neglectful, and even harmful parents be considered and perhaps preserved? What's the matter with this apparently well-run institution? Why is that simple boarding home better for the child? How can I look at adoption in an objective way? The answers can not be stated simply without effort on the part of the professional, but if he wants support for his program, or, better yet, wants to help the child, the effort must be made.

Any director must regret that he is able to persuade so few of his board to attend conferences, but those who come always find it worth while to discuss problems together. Some of them are trivial, no doubt, such as the old-fashioned names of some agencies that the legalists on our boards cling to so valiantly. Some are questions of mechanics, such as number of members on a board, how chosen, type, terms, and so on. Questions of policies are among the really interesting and important topics. Having accepted the need for a trained staff, how can we continue to be necessary to the agency? How can we be continually aware of what the children need? How can we make the social worker our partner and not regard him as our agent only? And how can we help the worker to recognize that the board member has roots in the community that entail handicaps as well as responsibilities? After all, we can't torment our friends and relations with problems which possibly should be their concern too, but which they do not recognize as such. We have to live with them.

It is rather interesting to find at these meetings that others are even deeper in perplexities and problems than we are and to be able to tell them how we have made what headway we have. It is helpful to learn that others have solved some problems we have not. It is something to know it can be done. To be sure, we often come home to fresh difficulties which call for a great deal of courage. The board member must be reconciled to working between the progressive professional and the slow-moving lay group who has to be shown, and not once only, but again and again. It becomes daily more important that such gains as have been made in standards and breadth of services to children be kept. This can be done only through the wisdom and vigilance of the citizen, and particularly the citizen who as a board member knows their value.

—GERTRUDE TAGGART

Officers of the Child Welfare League Board*

1. Mr. Leonard W. Mayo, President, needs no further introduction than that to be found in the November issue of the BULLETIN.

2. Miss Loula F. Dunn, First Vice-President, began her social work career as a case worker in the Foster Home Division of the State Department of Child Welfare of Alabama, her native State, her responsibilities increasing as she became supervisor and later executive of that Department.

In 1934 she was appointed Regional Supervisor of Social Work in connection with the Works Progress Administration in six states, having previously served as Director of Social Service for the Alabama Relief Administration. In her work with these agencies she achieved a national reputation through her success in effecting sound Federal-State relationships.

Miss Dunn was appointed Commissioner of the State Department of Public Welfare in Alabama on October 30, 1937, and has served continuously since then in this capacity.

She was recently re-elected Vice-President of the American Public Welfare Association. She is Chairman of the Children's Committee of the Council of State Public Welfare and Public Assistance Administrators and is a member of the Advisory Committee on Community Child Welfare Services of the United States Children's Bureau.

**In the next several issues this space will be devoted to introducing the officers of the League's Board of Directors.*

NEWS FROM THE FIELD

Homemaker Service

"Supervised Homemaker Service." The United States Children's Bureau calls attention to this, the new streamlined name for housekeeper service. It focusses the attention directly on the purpose of the service—*homemaker*. Miss Maud Morlock is available for consultation on organization and administration of "Supervised Homemaker Service."

The National Committee on Supervised Homemaker-Housekeeper Service in America, representing twenty-five different child and family agencies, met in Cleveland, Ohio, recently for a two-day conference on current practices throughout the country and to evolve basic principles of service. Delegates from W.P.A. Housekeeper Service took a lively interest in the discussions. Among the topics considered were:

1. Difference in philosophy and attitudes toward the Service.
2. Need for accepted uniform terminology.
3. Recruiting, supervision, and training of housekeepers.

As much needs to be done by way of planning for the work of the National Committee an Advisory Committee has been set up to serve for the present year and up to and through the 1941 National Conference of Social Work.

For more detailed information, write Mrs. Elinore R. Woldman, Chairman National Committee Housekeeper Service, Huron-Sixth Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

Case Recording, The Ohio Committee

THE Ohio Committee of the Child Welfare League of America has a sub-committee on record writing under the chairmanship of Daniel R. Elliott. The following is excerpted from their progress report to date:

"The purpose of this sub-committee is two-fold, to stimulate interest in League activities by encouraging staff participation and to clarify our thinking regarding the purpose and use of records.

"The Committee is in full accord with Gordon Hamilton's thinking as to the basic purpose of a record which is to 'improve the quality of service to the client, and to help the worker understand the client in his situation.' How do we help the client? Theoretically, it was generally agreed that diagnosis and treatment was the logical method of being most helpful to the client. It was also pointed out that supervision plays a vital part in evaluating the service to the clients through the use of records. For supervision a

considerable amount of time is required for reading. Most agencies say, however, that their records are seriously behind in dictation, and they are not available for a study and evaluation of treatment at the time of the conference. If records do happen to be up to date, often either the worker or the supervisor have not had the time to read them. Part of the time is spent in reviewing the situation verbally.

"In view of this reality picture, can we afford to realign our time so we can use records as we theoretically wish to, or had we better write records for the use we actually make of them?"

"Mechanics of record writing have played an important part in the Committee's thinking, and not the least of these has been cost. Outside groups in the community have questioned the need for such extensive records. This indicates that if the present procedure of record writing is justified, we must prepare ourselves to defend it, and if there is any way of improving it, we owe it to the client and the community to do so. Any savings possible in this category will assist with needs, which are not being met within our agencies. None of the agencies have made an accurate study, but one made a rough estimate of \$10.00 per year per record. Another about \$12.50 per year per record or a total of \$16,500 per year spent for case recording, which is a significant figure. Considerable attention has been given to other mechanics.

"A number of suggestions for improvement are being studied at present by the Committee. To get at these, a detailed study is being made of how and by whom records are used. This will serve as a basis for recommending certain guides to be used in practical case recording. It seemed to the Committee that clarity in thinking regarding case work purpose reflects itself in the clarity of purpose and use of case records. A complete report should be ready by April 1, 1941. A full copy of the progress report may be had by writing to Mr. Daniel Elliott, 1001 Huron Rd., Cleveland. We will also welcome any reactions or thinking of other agency record-writing groups."

Child Labor Day, January 25-27, 1941

FOR thirty-five years, the last week-end in January has been designated as Child Labor Day. Churches, schools, women's organizations and civic agencies have taken this occasion to rally public sentiment against the exploitation of children.

Radical changes have occurred in the child labor picture since the first Child Labor Day. Many of the worst abuses are gone forever. But many thousands of children are still employed under conditions that threaten their health and their education. Efforts must not be relaxed.—National Child Labor Committee, 419 Fourth Avenue, New York City.

Case Record Exhibit

THE League is pleased to announce another service to members in the preparation of a case record exhibit.

From time to time member agencies have expressed a wish to exchange case records. This desire for an exchange of experiences grows out of a thoughtful concern with how best to serve clients and community.

Changes in case work concept and process must be reflected in current case records which most agencies will welcome interchanging. The League therefore invited a committee to discuss how this might be achieved. It was decided that the League sponsor a case record exhibit to be held at the coming National Conference in Atlantic City. After the conference the records are to be available for circulation among member agencies. A Case Record Exhibit Committee, whose members represent fourteen different areas in the country, have formulated plans. Each will serve as a regional chairman of a local committee to which member agencies are invited to submit records. Wholehearted cooperation is anticipated, from both the public and the private field. Records will be welcomed that cover complete case work jobs from application for service through discharge from service, and others that cover selected portions of a service case work, like the application and intake procedure in the public, the private, the protective and the foster care fields, the preparation for placement, the placement process, and the understanding of behavior and development. The committee recognized that the case work process is a continuing one, that such arbitrary divisions as application interviews, are artificial, and that what happens between the worker and client during one of these periods effects changes in the continued relationship. For special emphasis and study, however, it was decided to invite records that will indicate recording of case work methods as well as methods of recording.

Submit records indicating the following:

I. *Complete records* from time of application for service through the period of discharge from service.

II. Selected portions of records showing:

A. *Diagnosis of need.* This should include the application for service, and case work that helped worker and client to a better understanding of what help the client needed, what he could take and use, and whether the agency was able to give him the service he needed. This might have been achieved in a single interview or a series of interviews in which the agency function is interpreted through work with individuals, parent-child or other sources of referral. The final decision, that is, whether the person accepted

the service or whether he rejected it or was referred to another agency for service, would hopefully be included in this record.

B. *Case work treatment* as it continues after decision by client to accept services of agency.

The help we can give any one will depend upon what he wants and his ability to use the help, so that there may be different levels of help to any of the individuals involved in the actuation. There are times when for these very reasons it seems necessary to concentrate the case work relationship directly with one or another of people concerned. We would like, therefore, to have records that show:

1. Examples of case work where the major emphasis of the agency has to be with the parent either:

a. To relieve a certain amount of strain so the parent can accept the services for his child, be they in his own home, or that he may allow his child to continue to live in the institution or boarding home,

b. Towards some growth or development that the parent may be able to plan a change in treatment, as return home from foster care or accept foster care from the home, and

c. Towards the general development of a more consistent family relationship.

2. Direct work with the child which would indicate the dynamics of the relationship in which a child may achieve strength in handling himself in the conflicting demands made by parents, foster parents, teachers, friends, etc. This would include records that would show how a child was helped to participate in and take responsibility for living with the situation, whether in his own home or in foster care. Here would be included records of direct work done with the child by worker, psychiatrist or both. When the child is at a spot where he seems unable to use the situation he is in, some agencies refer him to a guidance clinic. Clinic records are also invited.

3. Work with foster parents.

a. Home finding—some complete records that indicate the entire process from the acceptance of the application to the decision of the foster parents and agency that the home would be used either for boarding (long time or temporary) or adoption. We would hope to have records that would show both the process and the basis for the decision.

b. Records that indicate why a home was not accepted for use, and how either the withdrawal by the foster parent or the refusal by the agency was handled.

c. Continued work with the foster parent after the placement of the child. As in the case where the case work was done directly with the parent, this would imply a situation where, in the best interests of the child's growth and development, the major burden of the work must be done with the foster mother or foster parent that she may be able to help the child in his situation.

Records of work with foster parents will include evaluation and continued evaluation of the interest, need and capacity of the foster mother to work with the agency in that capacity. Some indication of variety of types of relationship which workers have with foster parents in the interests of a child's placement is being sought.

III. Special forms of recording, as chronological, summary, condensed.

We hope that no agency will feel too overwhelmed to make a contribution because of the wide area upon which this outline focuses attention. Even the sum total of records submitted may not necessarily cover this area. The outline is presented in such detailed form in the hope that it will enable the participating agencies more readily to find some point of special interest or emphasis on which they would prefer to submit a record.

—HENRIETTA L. GORDON, for the

Child Welfare League of America, Committee on Record Exhibit

Campaign for Connie Maxwell

THOSE who read in the June BULLETIN of the interesting self-study undertaken by the Connie Maxwell Orphanage of Greenwood, S. C., will doubtless be interested in the outcome. The Commission of nine appointed by the Baptist State Convention in the fall of 1939, at the instigation of Dr. A. T. Jamison, the Superintendent, made their report to the Convention in 1940. The full reports of the various subcommittees with their frank criticisms and suggestions had been submitted in advance to the Baptist constituency in the monthly publication of the Orphanage. At the Convention the reports were discussed in detail and accepted unanimously.

Prior to the Annual Convention a start had been made in raising money to meet the necessary recommendations through the addition to the staff of a person to give part time to the general solicitation of funds and with the help of the Sunday schools throughout the State. Following the acceptance of the report by the General Board of the Baptist denomination in South Carolina, a campaign during 1941 was launched to raise \$50,000 for replacements, repairs, and augmented program at Connie Maxwell.

This money is to be used to increase the services to South Carolina children in need of help. It is a tribute to Dr. Jamison's forty years of service which will be celebrated in this year, the year of Golden Jubilee for the Connie Maxwell Orphanage.

Dr. L. M. Latimer, Chairman of the Commission, in presenting the report at the Convention gives full tribute to Dr. Jamison in the following words:

" . . . Our people love him and honor him for his devoted, tireless service, but few can realize the high place he holds in the confidence and esteem of the leaders of child welfare work in the nation. He has won this place not because he has sought it, but as pointed out in the report, it is because of his close study of the best in this field, his long time planning, his consecrated Christian character, and his devotion to dependent children. . . The finest tribute that the Orphanage Commission could pay to the high character of the service rendered by Connie Maxwell is its recommendation that the administration continue to meet the needs and problems of the future in the same progressive, forward looking spirit that characterizes the institution today."

BOOK NOTES

FEEDING THE FAMILY: by Mary Swartz Rose, 421 pp., 4th Edition, 1940. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1940. \$3.75.

Feeding the Family, now in its fourth edition, carries on a tradition of service that was begun with the publication of the first edition in 1916. Its purpose is "to help those who regard their own health and that of their families as worthy of their best efforts, and who recognize that while many things contribute to health—sleep, fresh air, and exercise, for instance—the most fundamental consideration is food." Food plans as well as extensive lists in portions commonly served are given.

The nutritive values of foods are shown in relation to caloric value and to cost.

Dietaries for the underweight and the overweight are included, and a chapter on food for the sick and the convalescent pays particular attention to the diet in food allergy, in tuberculosis, and in fevers.

This book is comprehensive and practical and is of value to all who are concerned in furthering good nutrition either through the management of dietaries or through teaching.

—DOROTHY RIDLER

Nutritionist, Welfare Federation of Cleveland

THE FIRST FIVE YEARS OF LIFE—A Guide to the Study of the Preschool Child. A. Gesell, H. M. Halverson, H. Thompson, F. L. Ilg, B. M. Gastner, L. B. Ames, C. S. Amatruda—Yale Clinic of Child Development. Harper and Bros. 1940.

Fifteen years ago Gesell published a book under the same title. In the new book the technical sections are detailed, complete and lucid, yet there can be no doubt that the authors consider them of lesser importance than "a working philosophy of growth" which they endeavor to promote through their book.

In the first part Gesell "paints" sketches of the various maturational levels from birth to the sixth year molar, revealing a seasoned understanding and a great love of children. They should be read by any one parent, teacher, nurse or social worker.

Gesell emphasizes time and again the developmental approach to the task of child guidance as against a static measure of the child's accomplishments and shortcomings. This is illustrated by such an important principle as that the child, in much of his behavior, learns backward rather than forward. He undresses before he dresses, takes a morsel of food out of his mouth before he puts it in, has to understand puddles before he can stop making them and empties wastebaskets before he fills them. He points

up that something more fundamental than management lies at the basis of serious feeding problems although management has much to do with the success or failure of eating. A number of excellent practical suggestions follow.

Throughout the book there are warnings against "narrow mechanical psychometry." With children whose equipment either physical or experiential deviates from the normal, repeated examinations are necessarily supplemented by observations of the home behavior and by an evaluation of the child's response to a carefully planned training program carried on over a period of months or years. With normal children special caution is emphasized: single factors do not establish age levels, are not weighted, added or subtracted; the aggregate picture tells the story. When there is a wide scattering in the four basic fields of behavior (motor, adaptive, language and personal-social), the "psychometrically minded" would like to calculate a compromise value, yet such a value is declared meaningless! This is the biggest step away from the traditional testing and measuring I have ever heard of.

Gesell repeatedly refers to the entire preschool population of the country. Psychological understanding and guidance counts for little if it is not applied to the life of the millions of underprivileged, handicapped and neglected children. What he has to say about the readaptation of kindergartens and nursery schools opens altogether new vistas. Kindergartens and nursery schools cannot be indefinitely multiplied. Instead Gesell suggests a part-time and differential attendance, and the conversion of the preschools into demonstration and guidance centers.

Our only criticism of the present book is that the broad developmental concept of the child does not include enough of the emotional aspects of the child's life.

—LILLI E. PELLER

BORROWED CHILDREN: By Mrs. St. Loe Strachey, 149 pp. The Commonwealth Fund, New York. 1940.

This readable book, while written about the evacuation of English children in England, will nevertheless prove to be extremely helpful to all who are concerned with the plans of hospitality for such children as come to the United States.

Seven hundred thousand unaccompanied children, uprooted from city life, were dropped with no by-your-leave in small city and town homes by "billeting officers." A quick census of number of rooms available, rather than suitability, and a desire to welcome a child into the family were determining

factors in the choice of homes. Where a preference for age and sex was made, it seems to have been the exception that it could be fulfilled. While many papers and people called the scheme a failure, as you read the book you cannot fail to see that it was by no means without its successes and may well lead to unexpected and worthwhile results.

There is a point which seems extremely well taken and important for the American families who have taken in our few "European Children." That these children need affection and lots of it is self-evident; that they need sympathetic understanding is also clear; but that the new home should supplant the old is most undesirable, and particularly that there should be developed such a close bond as parent-child relationship is not to be desired. In both our countries and over many years, there has been a group which at its best has solved this problem perfectly—the professional children's nurse. The mutual affection, even the dependence of the child on the nurse, is there, but always with the parents in the background. At all times, there is the knowledge that the tie can and ultimately will be broken. American foster parents might do worse than to pattern themselves on the best nurse they ever knew, in anticipation of the crucial "return home."

The book, while necessarily inconclusive, will interest thoughtful foster parents.

—MARGARET CURTIS

Chairman of the Greater Britain Branch of the U. S. Committee for Care of European Children

Available for Circulation

English Children—Are They So Different? by Eric H. Biddle, *The Child*, November-December, 1940.

The Visiting Teacher Prepares a Child for Placement, *The Family*, November, 1940.

Foster Home Care for Children, by Jessie Taft, *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, November, 1940.

Social Worker in the Field of Adoption, by Florence Clothier, *Mental Hygiene*, April, 1940.

A Decade of Experience in Adoption, by Ora Pendleton, *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*.

Supervision of the First-Year Worker, *The Family*, October, 1940.

Home-Saving through Housekeeper Service, *The Child*, October, 1940.

Four Milestones of Progress, by Homer Folks, *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Philadelphia, November, 1940.

Social Breakdown: A plan for measurement and control. *The Family*, January, 1941. A symposium which includes the points of view of the case worker and the executive of the social agency, the research worker, the sociologist, the psychiatrist and, lastly, the Community Chest, on can a tool be found to measure the social well-being of a community, and the effectiveness of its social welfare program in the treatment of its social ills.